

### REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

After entry of the foregoing amendment, Claims 1, 4-16, 18-23, 25-31, and 34-41 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 14, 18, 19, 23, 31, and 35 are amended without introduction of new matter; and Claims 2, 3, 17, 24, 32, and 33 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. No new matter is added.<sup>1</sup>

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1, 4-6, 10, 14-16 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,144,784 to Shigehara et al. (hereinafter “Shigehara”); Claims 2 and 7-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Shigehara in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. U.S. 2001/0030786A1 to Takehashi et al. (hereinafter “Takehashi”); Claim 11 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Shigehara in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,751,372 B2 to Feuer et al. (hereinafter “Feuer”); Claim 12 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Shigehara in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,778,780 B1 to Cao et al. (hereinafter “Cao”); Claims 13, 21 and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Shigehara in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,411,417 B1 to Roberts et al. (hereinafter “Roberts”); Claims 23 and 25-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Takehashi in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,704,509 B1 to Yang et al. (hereinafter “Yang”); Claims 29 and 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Takehashi and Yang in view of Roberts; Claims 31 and 34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,538,783 to Steven in view of Shigehara; Claims 32 and 35-38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Stevens and Shigehara in view of Takehashi; Claim 39 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

---

<sup>1</sup> Support for the amended claims is self-evident from the claims as originally filed.

as unpatentable over Stevens, Shigehara, and Takehashi in view of Feuer; Claim 40 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Stevens, Shigehara, and Takehashi in view of Cao; Claim 41 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Stevens, Shigehara, and Takehashi in view of Roberts; and Claims 3, 17-19, 24 and 33 were indicated as allowable if rewritten to include all limitations of their base claims and intervening claims.

Applicants acknowledge with appreciation the indication of allowable subject matter.

Claims 1, 14, 23, and 31 are amended to include the allowable features of Claims 3, 17, 24, and 33, respectively, and including the limitations of any intervening claims.

Consequently, in light of the above discussion and in view of the present amendment, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and an early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



James J. Kulbaski  
Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 34,468

Customer Number  
**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 06/04)

JJK/MEM/STD/kke

Michael Monaco  
Registration No. 52,041